

**Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board**

1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 3, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825
TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2666/ FAX: (916) 263-2668
www.slpab.ca.gov



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY BOARD
San Francisco State University
Burk Hall #28
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132
(916) 263-2666**

**CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
January 14, 2005
MEETING MINUTES**

Committee Members Present

Chairperson Bruce Gerratt, Ph.D.
Alison Grimes, Au.D.
Marcia Raggio, Ph.D.
Diana Verdugo, M.S.

Staff Present

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer
Candace Raney, Board Staff
Lori Pinson, Board Staff
Ann Bollenbacher, Board Staff
George Ritter, Staff Counsel
Department of Consumer Affairs
Albert Balingit, Staff Counsel
Department of Consumer Affairs

Board Members Present

James Till, Ph.D.
Sherry Washington, M.A.
Rebecca Binge, M.A.

Guests Present

Jody Winzelberg, California Academy of Audiology
Dennis Van Vliet, Audiologist
Merrilyn Tuma, Speech-Language Pathologist
Lisa O'Connor, Speech-Language Pathologist
Robert Powell, California Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Joe Kanon, California Pacific Medical Center
Deb Swain, Speech-Language Pathologist
Leland Bennett, Speech-Language Pathologist

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Gerratt called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

II. Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

III. Approval of meeting minutes for October 26, 2004 Telephonic Committee Meeting

The Committee discussed minor grammatical edits to the minutes.

M/S/C: Grimes/Raggio

The Committee approved the October 26, 2004 Telephonic Committee Meeting minutes as amended.

IV. Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Course Review Consider Appeal Regarding the Denial for Continuing Professional Development Course Credit: "Navigating Cyberspace: In Search of Intervention Materials for SLPs" sponsored by HEALTH ED Continuing Education Programs

Mr. Gerratt introduced the discussion item and commented that the course information contained in the meeting packets is extensive and provides a clear understanding of the course designed to assist speech-language pathologists with locating speech and language intervention materials on the internet.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that her decision to deny the course was based solely on the course advertisement, which describes a course on the use of the internet and available search engines that practitioners may use to seek web-based information. She stated that she viewed the course as an offering intended to make the attendees internet savvy, wherein the primary beneficiary is the licensee.

Ms. Raggio commented that technology has changed service delivery in most professions, including speech-language pathology and audiology, and that more practitioners are turning to the internet to gather relevant data about pathologies and therapy strategies to better serve the needs of their clients. She stated that she believes the course to be of significant value to the practitioner and, to an even greater extent, to the consumer.

Ms. Grimes referenced the course outline and remarked that the section of the offering specifically devoted to helping practitioners differentiate between practice-specific peer-reviewed and well-documented research versus anecdotal and unproven information is, in fact, professional learning.

Mr. Gerratt concurred with the other members of the Committee and added that the course meets the requirements defined in the CPD regulations under the definition of indirect client care courses, in that navigating the internet for speech-language pathology research and/or treatment information is a "pragmatic aspect of clinical practice."

M/S/C: Grimes/Raggio

The Committee voted to overturn the denial of the course entitled “Navigating Cyberspace: In Search of Intervention Materials for SLPs.”

V. Meet Professionals Interested in Serving As Volunteer Subject-Matter Experts for the Board’s Continuing Professional Development Program: Provide Overview of Workload and Processes Related to Course Review and Assessment of Existing Program Requirements

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the purpose of this agenda discussion was to provide the interested subject-matter experts an opportunity to meet the Committee members and to discuss the duties that will be assigned to the volunteers with respect to both the future task of reviewing proposed CPD courses and the more immediate assignment of providing input into the course submission and evaluation process. Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that, although Senate Bill 1913, which established the authority for the Board to approve all CPD course offerings, took effect January 1, 2005, the Board could not enforce the new law until it established implementing regulations and secured the necessary work force. Ms. Del Mugnaio referenced various CPD materials provided in the meeting packets and distributed the current CPD laws and regulations, a listing of courses previously reviewed by the Board, a current listing of Board-approved CPD providers, and a listing of audiology practice terms as prepared by the audiology Board members for staff use.

Ms. Del Mugnaio asked the attendees to reference the set of documents regarding the proposed CPD emergency regulations. She explained that the proposed changes as noted in the documents have not yet been adopted by the Board but were prepared for discussion purposes and may be voted on by the Board at the meeting the following day.

Ms. Del Mugnaio introduced Ms. Bollenbacher as the Board’s new CPD coordinator and commended Ms. Bollenbacher for her four years of exceptional public service as the Board’s licensing assistant and front-office staff person. Ms. Bollenbacher received a promotion to a Management Services Technician with primary responsibility for the Board’s CPD program. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that this reassignment of duties within the office will alleviate Ms. Pinson from having to divert her attention from licensing, and will reduce the time she spends managing the CPD program.

Ms. O’Connor asked whether the Board is proposing to review all courses, even those offered by exempt providers named in the law.

Mr. Powell suggested that the Board consider an exemption for practice-relevant courses offered by the state and national professional associations due to the volume of courses offered by these organizations.

Ms. Del Mugnaio replied and indicated that almost all of the courses appealed before the Committee have been courses approved by a national professional organization.

Ms. O’Connor suggested that the Board designate certain subject areas as “approved,” such as language disorders, adult and child communication strategies, dysphasia, etc.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that, based on the numbers provided by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, representing in excess of 12,000 continuing education courses offered in a given year, the Board may need to establish an alternate evaluation process.

Mr. Ritter suggested that the Board could craft regulations that would define a “self-certification process” for specified providers, enabling the providers to certify to the Board that their courses have been evaluated internally and meet the Board’s CPD criteria.

The Committee agreed that this was a reasonable alternative but commented that audits must be conducted to verify that the certification process is being employed appropriately.

Mr. Ritter suggested that the regulations specify a revocation process should the certification process be abused.

Ms. Del Mugnaio reiterated that the interested volunteers should consider a reasonable course review time frame for courses that require independent review, as they will be charged with issuing the recommendations within a set time frame. She referenced the proposed amendments and inquired as to whether the imposed 30-day timeframe for evaluating course submissions was too restrictive.

Ms. Washington suggested that courses be accepted by means of electronic media, and that the Board consider expedited course reviews for providers who transmit information electronically. She also suggested that the Board post a listing of approved and denied courses on the Board’s website to educate licensees and providers of the content areas that have been deemed acceptable as CPD for license renewal.

Mr. Van Vliet inquired whether multiple subject-matter experts would review the same course material, arguing that this may provide a more objective evaluation. He stated that some subject-matter experts may have biases about certain providers or course topics.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the courses will be reviewed by one subject-matter expert, and that the experts who are selected to serve must complete a conflict of interest form agreeing to excuse themselves from situations that create a personal or professional conflict.

Mr. Bennett inquired as to whether the experts could meet in the future to establish standardized review guidelines and possibly create an application form for providers to use when submitting course information to the Board.

Ms. Del Mugnaio responded and stated that a meeting of the experts may be useful in the future once the experts are selected and are provided with a framework for developing review processes. She further stated that the proposed regulations prescribe the information required for course consideration, but do not require a application form because this allows providers more flexibility in how the information is captured and organized. She added that a form could be developed in the future if the

subject-matter experts found that providers are unclear about the information that should be submitted for consideration of course approval.

Ms. Tuma inquired about when the Committee may notify the interested professionals whether they have been selected to serve as subject-matter experts and at what point the experts would receive courses for review.

Ms. Del Mugnaio reported that Mr. Gerratt would be reviewing the applications from the speech-language pathologists and would announce the selected individuals the following day at the Board meeting, and that Ms. Grimes would do the same for the interested audiologists. She stated that the course review process would not be implemented until the emergency CPD regulations were finalized and adopted by the state, which could take up to four months.

Ms. Swain inquired about the number of experts needed to serve.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that, based on the responses received from the CPD providers, the Board should expect a heavy course review workload during the initial review phase and, as such, will need the services of all of the qualified subject-matter experts who applied. She suggested that additional experts may be necessary, and encouraged others to apply.

Ms. O'Connor inquired whether the new course review requirements would impact the speech-language pathology assistant's continuing education requirements.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the new requirements would not affect the assistant's continuing education requirements. She explained that the requirements for assistants are less restrictive in order to provide the assistant and supervisor the flexibility to create a continuing education plan that reflects the professional learning needs of the assistant based on the assistant's employment setting and assigned tasks.

A general discussion ensued regarding course review processing timelines.

The Committee agreed to change the proposed emergency regulation language to reflect a 45-day maximum review time frame.

VI. Review Proposed Continuing Professional Development Emergency Regulations: California Code of Regulation Sections 1399.151.1, 1399.160.3, 1399.160.6, & 1399.160.7

Ms. Raggio provided grammatical edits to the document entitled "Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board Finding of Emergency," which establishes the basis for filing the continuing professional development regulation proposal as an emergency filing.

Mr. Ritter indicated that he prepared draft regulation language establishing the self-certification process and proceeded to read the language to the Committee. He also suggested a wording change to the proposed language wherein a section of the statute is referenced referring to exempt continuing professional development providers. Mr. Ritter

suggested that the language state that the “entities are recognized, approved, or accredited under...” as opposed to the wording “entities listed in.”

Ms. Del Mugnaio reiterated that she would make the recommended changes to the processing timelines reflecting the 45-day time frame.

Ms. Grimes suggested that the reference in the proposed language under Section 1399.160.3 (c) regarding courses offered “by hearing aid manufacturers or hearing aid dealers” be amended by striking the language “or hearing aid dealers,” as the reference to “dealers” is somewhat confusing.

M/S/C: Grimes/Raggio

The Committee voted to recommend to the full Board to adopt the proposed continuing professional development regulations as amended, and to approve the regulation submission as an emergency filing.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that, since many interested professionals located in southern regions of the state could not attend this meeting, she agreed to hold another forum in southern California in late February or early March. The Committee decided to schedule a southern California Continuing Professional Development meeting for Friday, March 11, 2005, to be held at the Providence Speech & Hearing Center in Orange.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Gerratt adjourned the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer